

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

FOR POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC REALISM

Vol. 23. No. 17.

Registered at G.P.O. as a Newspaper.
Postage (home and abroad) 1d.

SATURDAY, DECEMBER 24, 1949.

6d. Weekly.

From Week to Week

In every news bulletin during the polling in the General Election in Australia, the "B".B.C. (Chairman, Lord Simon, Manchester; Vice-Chairman STELLA, Mrs. Isaacs, Marchioness of Reading) repeated the fact that the Finance-Socialists, referred to as Labour, had retained the South Bradford seat in the bye-election. The Bradford and Leeds Districts have more Jews than "Israel" i.e. Palestine.

An item of news referring to an address by Sir Graham Cunningham, who recently resigned from the post of Chairman of the Dollar Exports Board was cut off in mid-transmission.

A few of next day's (Friday, December 9) newspapers printed the suppressed item. It read "As the Government seemed to be so touchy, he must try to be as impartial as possible. In case you don't know, I think they are an awful Government, and the sooner they are out, the better." Sir Graham was of course referring to the "British" Government.

A few months before the Australian General Elections control of the Melbourne *Argus*, an influential daily which was beginning to expose Jewish finance, was bought by the *Daily Mirror* (London) Group which is widely believed to represent Mr. Israel Moses Sieff and his friends, amongst whom is Mr. Aneurin Bevan. Since the purchase, the *Argus* has been strongly Finance-Socialist.

A fluent German linguist of our acquaintance recently picked up a broadcast in German, but obviously proceeding from behind the Iron Curtain, which began with a panegyric on Lenin the Prophet, the Saviour of Mankind, and so on. This lasted for about fifteen minutes. The speaker was then changed, and the second speaker delivered a scathing attack on Wall Street, which, as our informant remarked, was such as might have delighted the heart of a Social Crediter. But note: Wall Street was identified with *Morgan*, and the name of Morgan was hammered in, in endless repetition, no other name being even mentioned. This incident may be significant.

No one troubles to deny that the so-called Russian Revolution was a Jewish plot financed by Jacob Schiff (Kuhn Loeb & Co.) the friend and opposite number of Sir Ernest Cassel and the leader of the "American" Jews who fought tooth and nail against the British and for the Germans in the first two years of the First World War, and then ratted and fought against the Germans. So far as we are aware, the name of Morgan has never been specifically connected with Bolshevism. The venomous attack by the Kremlin on Morgans suggests that the Schiff-Cassel-Rothschild interests are fighting Morgans through the Moscow-Communist Kremlin. It is perhaps unnecessary to suggest that our Current Administration is Kuhn Loeb, etc.; what we have to watch is that, having been sold down the river to Pine Street, we are not re-sold to Moscow.

There are certain aspects of this situation which transcend in importance anything in the world to-day—in fact, it may not be too much to say that the material survival of the planet is involved. There appears to be no reasonable doubt that uranium products were sent to Russia secretly on the orders of Roosevelt; that Roosevelt sacrificed everything British to "Russian" interests and was surrounded by Jews of the Schiff group; that the United States is either going to fight Russia, in which case the usual arrangements are in course of preparation to insure that the fight shall be as bloody, long, and as destructive as possible ("Unconditional Surrender") so that "we have proceeded on the assumption that only in war, or under threat of war will the *United States* consent to large scale Planning." MONOPOLY. Or the Fifth Columns in Russia and Wall Street will make a deal over the heads of their "Governments", as a deal was made to eliminate once-Great Britain over the heads of (we hope) Churchill etc.; and the North American Continent will awake to find itself a Police State without having struck a blow in its own defence.

If anyone supposes that a Plot of this magnitude is being allowed to depend for success or failure on the gamble of even an "honest" secret ballot election; we can only observe that they ought to be handed over to the tender mercies of the Bishop of Birmingham.

Since writing the preceding note, we have received a cutting from the *Times Herald* (Washington D.C.) of November 28 which states in so many words that "the Defense Department has plans for a military dictatorship." The column is headed "Dictatorship could affect the whole world." ". . . the military leader acknowledged that the military might be loath to surrender control . . ."

Now you know your job. You have to stop *at any cost to the Plotters* the use of "war, or the threat of war" as an excuse for imposing a military (police) organisation on "the entire world." And you have to eliminate *at any cost to them* those who are working to produce and maintain that situation.

NEW ZEALAND, AUSTRALIA ?

Yes, very nice, and doubtless a step in the Right direction. But remember, we've had some, and tell your Member that "leave it to George" went out with George.

It is with deep regret that we must record the death of Sir Errol Knox, the distinguished Managing Editor of the Melbourne *Argus* until it came under the control of a London Group, apparently alarmed (and, as the elections show, with reason) at the effective exposure of the World Plot in the *Argus*.

Sir Errol developed heart trouble (?) during a flight back from England, and died a few days later.

PARLIAMENT

House of Commons: December 2, 1949.

[*] **British North America (No. 2) Bill** [*Lords*]

Order for Second Reading read.

The Secretary of State for Commonwealth Relations (Mr. Philip Noel-Baker): I beg to move, "That the Bill be now read a Second time."

I hope that it may receive a unanimous and speedy passage through this House. The Bill arises out of an Address presented to His Majesty by the Senate and the House of Commons of Canada, and its purpose is to enable the Federal Parliament of Canada to amend the Constitution of Canada in matters which lie within the jurisdiction of that Federal Parliament. The Bill is needed for the following reasons.

The Statute of Westminster of 1931 conferred upon all the self-governing members of the Commonwealth overseas full power to amend United Kingdom Acts which applied to them; but, at the request of Canada, an express provision, Section 7, was included in that statute. It provided that this power to amend United Kingdom Acts should not apply to the British North America Acts in which the Canadian Constitution is laid down. Those Acts therefore, and the Canadian Constitution, can at present only be amended by our United Kingdom Parliament here.

However, all parties in the United Kingdom have long been agreed that this situation should continue only as long as Canada desired. Ever since the Statute of Westminster was passed we have regarded ourselves as bound to give Canada the right to amend her own Constitution when she asked us to do so, but many people have felt that the present situation is anomalous and that it might be embarrassing either to the Canadian Parliament or to ourselves.

In 1946, the hon. Member for Wood Green (Mr. Baxter) said that the power of our Parliament to amend the Constitution of Canada, was, in his phrase,

"an anachronism."—[OFFICIAL REPORT, 26th July, 1946; Vol. 426, c. 391.]

The late Viscount Bennett, who had been Prime Minister of Canada, speaking in the same year, said that this was an anomaly, and that our Government ought to take the initiative in seeking agreement with the Canadian Government for its removal. In proposing the Address to His Majesty, the Canadian Prime Minister said in his House of Commons the other day:

"It is our responsibility to see that the fundamentals of the Canadian Constitution are protected and preserved. It is a matter to be settled in Canada by Canadians and for Canadians. . . . It should not be left as a burden on the Parliament of another nation."

I am sure that everybody in the United Kingdom must agree with what Mr. St. Laurent said. Indeed, our Noble colleagues in another place have already passed the Bill unanimously.

We are bound to the principle of the Bill, about which there is no party or other division. The Bill is cast in the terms of the Address adopted by the Federal Parliament of Canada, and, of course, we are all ready to do what they desire. In moving his Resolution about the Address to His Majesty, the Canadian Prime Minister said that it dealt with the attributes of Canada as an adult sovereign State

among the States of the world. Ever since the Peace Conference at Paris in 1919 I have had the privilege of watching the growth of the nationhood of the self-governing members of the Commonwealth. In that growth Canada has always been the leader in thought and action, as Sir Robert Borden and his followers were leaders in Paris 30 years ago. By what they have done in this regard Canada has rendered great services to her own country, to the Commonwealth and to the world.

Nobody in touch with the current of present day international affairs, whether in the Assembly and the Councils of the United Nations, in the specialised agencies, or in the Chanceries of the world, can doubt that Canada's nationhood is a factor of great, increasing and beneficent importance. I have just been in Canada and during my visit I found that Canadians of all parties and all provinces are conscious and proud as never before of Canada's position in world affairs and of the rights and responsibilities which it entails.

This Bill gives us a chance to pay a tribute to Canada as a nation, to all she has done as a nation for us over the last many years, and particularly in the last decade, and to all that she has done for mankind. I know that all sections of the House will wish to join with me in expressing to Canada our affection, our congratulations, and our gratitude not only for what Canada does, but, indeed, for what she is.

Mr. Oliver Stanley (Bristol, West): I rise only to associate my hon. Friends with what has been said by the right hon. Gentleman and to assure him that we shall give him every assistance in expediting the passage of this Bill. There can be no two thoughts about it. It is only because of Canada's express desire at the time of the Statute of Westminster that we now have to deal with this matter at all. It has always been recognised that what Canada in those days asked to remain should if Canada so asked be immediately removed. I am sure the whole House is glad to be able to do this thing for which Canada asks, small as it may seem to us, and in that way give some concrete example of the gratitude which we feel towards her.

In most moving terms the right hon. Gentleman has expressed the feeling of the country as a whole towards our sister nation. We owe her the deepest debt of gratitude not only for the great services and the great sacrifices which she bore in the war but also for the same sacrifices and the same services which, in the in some ways more difficult and more confused times of peace, she is still giving to this country with the same generosity and affection which we have known in the past and which we are confident will continue in the future.

Mr. Bramall (Bexley): In rising to join with the speakers on both Front Benches in supporting this Bill I wish to make reference to the terms of the only operative Clause of the Bill. The Clause indicates that although Canada is taking as we have long expected she would take and as she has every right to take, this step in ending the anomalous position about her Constitution, she still leaves with us the sole power to amend very important sections of it. This is not unique. I believe that the position is the same with regard to the Australian Constitution and that although Australia can amend her Constitution, the parts dealing with the powers of the States as against the Commonwealth still remain to be dealt with here.

It is noteworthy that this great nation, to which my right hon. Friend has so rightly and eloquently paid tribute,

[*] This debate is here given unabridged.—Editor, *The Social Crediter*.

should in these important and difficult matters—we know that they present great difficulties in any federation—of the powers of the provinces and, particularly in Canada, the respective rights of the two languages, still have such close unity with us that she is content to leave in the hands of this House the custodianship of those important parts of her Constitution.

Colonel Dower (Penrith and Cockermouth): I rise to join both sides of the House in welcoming the Bill and giving it our wholehearted support. My right hon. Friend the Member for West Bristol (Mr. Stanley) spoke of the great services which Canada rendered in the last war. We must not forget the great services she rendered in the first World War. In regard to the taking of Vimy Ridge the name of Canada will always live as long as Canadians live on the face of the earth. I do not want to ask any awkward questions, but the Statute of Westminster was passed quite a long time ago and I should like to know if there is any reason why this matter has not been brought forward before? If there is any reason I think we ought to be told. I feel sure that if Canada had asked for this earlier she would have been given the full support of this Parliament.

Mr. P. Noel-Baker: We all associate ourselves with what the hon. and gallant Gentleman the Member for Penrith and Cockermouth (Colonel Dower) has said about Canada's service in the First World War. Speaking about Canada's nationhood, Mr. Pearson, the Secretary of State for External Affairs, said not long ago that Canada won her independence fighting not against, but with Great Britain. Why has this not been done sooner? Because Canada did not ask us. There was the long interval of the war when matters like these were put aside; otherwise this would probably have happened before.

My hon. Friend the Member for Bexley (Mr. Bramall) is right in what he said about the powers which still remain with this Parliament. He is probably aware that the provincial legislatures of the provinces of Canada can amend their own provincial constitutions. They have full power in that regard. With regard to matters which are of mixed federal and provincial importance, the Canadian Government are holding, on 10th January next, a conference of the federal and provincial governments, and it may be—it may not, of course—that as a result of that conference we may be asked to pass another Bill. We must wait and see.

Question put, and agreed to.

Bill accordingly read a Second time and committed to a Committee of the Whole House.

Bill immediately considered in Committee; reported, without Amendment; read the Third time, and passed, without Amendment.

House of Commons: December 6, 1949.

Companies (Political Campaigns)

Mr. Palmer asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer what principles he applies to the assessment for Income Tax purposes of moneys used by industrial and other companies for political campaigns; and if he will state the extent to which the cost of such campaigns rank as a business expense.

Mr. Carmichael asked the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether his regulations permit the sums at present being spent by the industrial life offices, sugar-refining and cement

companies on anti-nationalisation propaganda to be allocated to expenses or make them liable to assessment for taxation.

Sir S. Cripps: As I explained in reply to a Question put by the hon. Member for Cambridge (Mr. Symonds) on 21st June last, expenditure by traders for political purposes is not permitted to be deducted in computing profits for the purposes of Income Tax or Profits Tax, and any claim to deduct the costs to which my hon. Friends refer would certainly be contested by the Inland Revenue.

Mr. H. D. Hughes: Yes, but in view of the increasing reliance of the Conservative Party on this type of contribution from vested interests, is my right hon. and learned Friend quite sure that the resources at the disposal of his Department for checking up on this are adequate?

Sir S. Cripps: Yes, I am quite satisfied.

Colonel Gomme-Duncan: In view of the complete dependence of the Labour Party on the Co-operatives and trades unions, can I ask the Chancellor whether the so-called education fund of the Co-operative Societies comes under this heading for tax purposes?

Sir S. Cripps: Perhaps the hon. and gallant Gentleman will put that question on the Paper.

Mr. Carmichael: May I ask the Chancellor whether inquiries are being made now, particularly with regard to the industrial assurance offices and the spending they are engaged in at the moment, to see if they are complying with the regulations as laid down in the answer?

Sir S. Cripps: Wherever Income Tax returns are made this matter is examined in the ordinary course of business.

Mr. Pickthorn: In view of the particular competence of the right hon. and learned Gentleman, might he not explain to the House and to his hon. Friend behind him exactly what "vested interests" means?

Mr. Hughes: I will tell the hon. Gentleman afterwards.

Ironstone Workings, Northants

Mr. Mitchison (Kettering): Anyone visiting the countryside round Corby and Kettering must be appalled by the devastation that is being caused there by ironstone workings past and present. Drags and shovels seem to stand on every skyline and the whole countryside is disfigured by deep cuttings and large tracts of what is known as hill and dale—impassable areas of heaped limestone, quite useless for agriculture, and only capable at the most of some sort of tree planting.

This devastation of the countryside has been considered by Government after Government and by numerous committees, inspectors, standing conferences, public inquiries and so on. With more powerful modern machinery, both the rate of excavation and the number of excavating machines appear to be increasing and the devastation becomes continually more widespread and more obvious. Local feeling is becoming very strong indeed. I know of representations by such different bodies as the branches at Corby of the British Iron and Steel and Kindred Trades Association—the men who are actually working the iron ore into steel—the Free Churches of the district, the local branch of the Council for the Preservation of Rural England, the Rural Community Council, rambling clubs, an art society and so on.

The County Council have continually protested at public

(Continued on page 6.)

THE SOCIAL CREDITER

This journal expresses and supports the policy of the Social Credit Secretariat, which is a non-party, non-class organisation neither connected with nor supporting any political party, Social Credit or otherwise.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: *Home and abroad, post free:*
 One year 30/-; Six months 15/-; Three months 7s. 6d.

Offices: (Business) 7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2, Telephone: Central 8509; (Editorial) 49, PRINCE ALFRED ROAD, LIVERPOOL, 15, Telephone SEFton Park 435.

Vol. 23. No. 17.

Saturday, December 24, 1949.

To All Our Readers,
 A Merry Christmas and A Happy
 New Year.

*The International Slave-State

Recently we quoted Major Douglas's opinion, expressed in 1939, that one of the real, as opposed to the ostensible, objectives of the war was the setting-up of the international slave-state, on the Russian model, beginning with Great Britain.

It is quite beyond dispute that once-Great Britain is today more akin to a slave-state than she was in the year those words were written. An all-powerful Government, an *elite*, food-rationing, increasing direction of labour, and an all-pervading atmosphere of crisis, are the very hallmarks of the system whose leading exemplar is Soviet Russia.

The Socialist alibi for this acknowledged state of affairs is that it is, like the break-downs of the A.B.C. broadcasts, due to circumstances beyond their control. But no alibi alters the facts. The Socialist movement in all probability consists of a large number of dupes, with a leavening of traitors, and this, in accordance with the precept, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do" possibly exonerates the movement as a whole of complete complicity; but it does not dispose of the facts.

It is worth considering the sequence of some of the leading facts. They go back indefinitely; but those of the past eleven years are sufficiently revealing. In 1938 occurred the Munich 'crisis,' which postponed war. This postponement initiated a vitriolic propaganda campaign, shared by 'capitalistic' America and the Socialists in Great Britain, clamouring for war and vilifying all who opposed it. When war came in 1939, 'America' acquired British overseas investments, at bargain rates, in return for expendable munitions. It is this loss of overseas assets which forms the chief part of the current Socialist alibi.

The next phase begins with the entrance of 'America' into the war, and the subsequent domination of Allied strategy by 'American' interests. The direct result of this was the admission of Russia into half of Europe, and the making of 'agreements' which assured Russia of a dominating position

*From *The Australian Social Crediter* for November 19.

in the post-war world. This whole trend was confirmed and supported by UNRRA, which fed supplies predominantly to Russia and Russian controlled territories, and by the attempt to hand Greece over to the Communists and to throw Spain into renewed civil war.

It is fairly evident that the accession to power of the Socialists in Great Britain was carefully pre-arranged, just as it is evident that they are supported, *on terms*, by 'capitalist' America. But what is much more evident is that the sudden and unheralded termination of Lend-lease was a fully calculated move, dovetailed into the plan for a thousand million dollar American loan to Britain. And closely associated with these moves were a series of propagandist crises to justify a continued food-shortage, with concomitant rationing in Britain. There was first a shortage "due to war" (though during the war food-acreage restriction schemes were enforced); then a shortage "due to lack of ships" (though Liberty ships were tied up and rotting); and ultimately, and of course, a shortage "due to lack of dollars" (while thousands of tons of food are being stored in lime-stone caves "to keep up prices").

On top of all this, the devaluation of sterling and the plan (Truman's Point Four) for the acquisition of the assets of the British Empire follow like night the day.

This brief but clear course of events points unmistakably to the operation of a *policy*, the purpose of which is deducible from its effect. The effect is the elimination of Great Britain as a world Power; the purpose is the domination of the world by one Power.

So much, as a matter of fact, is actually admitted by some Socialists. They blame American Big Business—but jib at the analysis of the structure and personnel of Big Business.

On another page we quote the reported opinion of a Mr. Gerard, of United States Steel, that 64 men 'ran' the United States—only one of these being a politician. Unfortunately we cannot quote the list; on the other hand it is not difficult to construct a list of men who in fact do occupy key and dominating positions in the United States. The name of Truman pales into its original insignificance beside that of Bernard Baruch, or of David Lilienthal, or Morgenthau, all of whom, and others of their type and kind, remain while Presidents and Congresses come and go.

We cannot do better at this point than refer our readers to Major Douglas's *Brief for the Prosecution*, which analyses Big Business generally, and Finance particularly, in relation to the situation which confronts us. The essence of what emerges from this examination is, to quote from the book referred to: "The objective involves a perfectly clear, coherent, and continuous policy on the part of the Zionists. The conditions for successive and major crises must be created and maintained in the world; the means to deal with each crisis as it arises must be in the hands of Zionist Jews, directly or indirectly; and the use of these means must only be granted to the highest bidder in the surrender of power or the guarantee of its use in the interests of Jewry . . . legal control of raw materials is essential to the pursuit of the policy to a final and successful issue."

It is a fact, and a simple fact, that a large part of world finance, and world organisations controlling raw materials, are in the hands of Zionist Jews; and the headquarters of these organisations are for the most part in the United States—for the moment. And what appears to be 'American' policy is in fact *Zionist* policy, temporarily identi-

fied with U.S. State policy as an axe is identified with the purpose of its wielder. To state this fact is not 'anti-Semitic'; but it is anti-Zionist. *Zionism is a world policy to which the sufferings of the British, in particular, and the world in general, can be directly traced.* And "it is something very different to a simple scheme for the return of the Jews to Palestine . . . [it is] the moulding of events and Governments to procure a world domination for 'Israel.'"

This is the situation which the better Socialists uneasily divine; and it is the situation which has to be faced and fought. But most of them, like most of the Opposition, "would rather not."

A Poser for Planners

THE ELEVATION OF MEANS INTO ENDS IS THE ESSENCE OF SIN.

WORK FOR ALL—A NATIONAL TASK—Lord Woolton, *Sunday Times*, October 23.

NEXT ELECTION TO BE FOUGHT ON THE ONE FACTOR OF UNEMPLOYMENT—H. Nunes, *Western Morning News*, October 19.

Headed by these quotations, a correspondent, Mr. T. V. Holmes, has sent the following letter to the author of the last of them:—

Lopwell Lodge, Roborough,
Plymouth.
October 24, 1949.

"Dear Mr. Nunes.

"*Litany to Beelzebub*, Grand Elevator of Means into Ends, the Patron Saint of FULL EMPLOYMENT, to be sung by a Chorus of Socialist Planners.

"We have induced the people to give up their Rights and Liberties, their safeguards of Magna Carta and Bill of Rights, and to enter unencumbered the Monopoly and Welfare State of Social Justice, Social Services and Directed Labour, from which no man shall Contract Out;

"We have induced the people to give up their Right to Property, even a Home, and their Right to Profit, or show Policy, Desire, Initiative and Enterprise, except as Planned;

"We have overthrown the Trinitarian Constitution of Christian principle, that 'Balance of Power' of Three in One and One in Three, wherein alone lay Freedom, and have substituted therefor the Totalitarian Tyranny of Judaic concept, the Almighty ONE;

"We have handed over the Sovereignty of Self within the Common Law, as of King in Parliament within the Constitution, to the 'New Despotism' of Planner Ukase, the Foreign Yoke of Debt Bondage and to World Organisations removed from our control;

"We have debauched the currency so that the World Credit Monopoly, Wall Street, might buy up the British Empire at bargain prices;

"We have yearly robbed the people of 40 per cent. of their earnings and deprived them of the goods of their labour, to dump them abroad that the Export Drive might flourish;

"We have induced the people to abandon completely the Power of the Purse, formerly guarded by their Representatives in Parliament, and to Centralise the Community's Credit in a "nationalised" Central Bank. Thereby we have been enabled since 1945 to increase the National Debt by £6,000 million and the International or Foreign Debt by other immense sums;

"We have appointed one bureaucrat overseer for every

four workers, and if necessary will appoint one such overseer to every three, or even two workers;

"We have, since 1945, given away in 'Unrequited Exports' as Gratuities to those imperial children whom we saved from foreign invasion, some £500 million in precious goods and services;

"We have, since 1945, given away in 'Gifts to Europe' including Reparations to Germany for the temporary defeat of 'Hitlerism' and his dream of 'United Europe', some £900 million;

"We have 'solved' the 'Dollar Crisis' by consenting to give more goods for less return, and will continue to 'solve' the Crisis throughout our lifetime (*vide* Mr. Jay) giving more and more goods for less and less return, until we have nothing more to give.

"ALL THESE AND OTHER SUCH ACTS have we done, our most precious and sacred cultural heritage and possessions have we gladly sacrificed at your altars, O Beelzebub, Grand Elevator of Means into Ends, whose essence is 'Service, not Self' (unlike Him 'whose service is perfect freedom') that it might please you to grant us now and for ever more, the INEFFABLE BLESSING (once foolishly considered "curse") of FULL EMPLOYMENT!

"Can Tory Planners, pursuing the same policy and 'advised' by the same Whitehall bureaucrat 'experts', expect to propitiate Beelzebub with less sacrifice for equal 'blessings'?

POSER FOR PLANNERS, SOCIALIST AND TORY. If it takes four years of "successful" Planning and Export Drive in a sellers' market of 'scarcity' to bring down the pound sterling from \$4.03 to \$2.80, how long will the intensified pursuit of the same policy, most probably in a buyers' market of 'plenty', take to bring down its value to zero? And when it is down to Zero, how long will it take to pay off the American Debt? OR IS THE BIG IDEA THAT A BRITAIN PURGED OF PRIDE CREDIT AND CHRISTIAN PRECEPT SHALL THEN CONSENT TO ENTER THE WORLD COMMUNIST STATE IN LIEU OF PAYMENT?

"Yours sincerely, . . ."

Light in Dark Places?

"For the last quarter of a century, 'Science' and 'Technology,' or the elaboration, or multiplication, of Techniques, have suffered a high degree of confusion. There has been a marked acceleration in this respect since the early stages of the late war . . . The pace is still accelerating in the Medical and Industrial Sciences. But at the higher levels of Scientific thought there has been continuously a reaction. This reaction is becoming more marked. . . .

"The tendency of Technological education is to abolish not to equip or enhance thought in a general sense. The trainee becomes progressively a skilled reader of indices, the application of which he understands in relation to his social function; but the meaning of which he does not understand. Nor, indeed, does he believe there is a meaning. He has released from his mechanisms what was inherent in them from their inception (which was itself the 'product' of another mechanism or the same or a like order), and there is nothing else. . . .

"That a complete breakdown of thought and the application of the results of thought should ensue from persistence along these lines is a matter of intuition rather than demonstration."—(*Abstracted from NOTES in circulation in a British University*).

PARLIAMENT (continued from page 3.)

inquiries and in other ways, while 10 borough and district councils recently formed a deputation to the Minister on the subject and the National Association of Parish Councils made it the first resolution—a unanimous one—that they passed at their recent meeting in London. None of these protests failed to recognise the real need for iron ore. They confined themselves to the need for full restoration after it has been excavated.

As long ago as 1945, my right hon. Friend promised a statement at the earliest opportunity. . . .

That was nearly three years ago. No such statement has yet been issued but in September, 1948, my right hon. Friend set up a standing conference with his Regional Controller as chairman and including representatives of the iron ore producers, other Government Departments and county councils to consider, or rather to reconsider, the technical aspects of the problem, which had already been reported on by Mr. Waters in 1946. The landowners and farmers were put on a second standing conference some months afterwards, apparently because the ironstone producers were unwilling to have them on the original standing conference. These standing conferences have recently issued interim reports, and once more my right hon. Friend has promised a statement of policy. I hope that it will be forthcoming very soon.

Meanwhile local inquiries have been held and are still being held into particular pieces of excavation, and their results await the statement of policy. So apparently do applications to mine or excavate a very large area of land, more than 28,000 acres in my constituency and 25,000 acres in the neighbouring constituency of my hon. Friend the Member for Peterborough (Mr. Tiffany). Meanwhile, the producers are continuing to excavate under informal arrangements, the terms of which are unknown.

The problem is not only an urgent but a complex one. The first point is the restoration of ground which was worked before planning control, and which has been left as hill and dale. . . . The first question I wish to ask my right hon. Friend is whether he will accept the principle that there should be restoration of these workings wherever it is physically or reasonably possible, and whoever pays for that?

May I add that Mr. Waters made his report in May, 1945. . . . at that time Mr. Waters estimated the total acreage involved would be 116,500 of probable and possible ironstone reserves. That was in 1945 and relates to the restoration of the past.

I suggest that the question of the present and future workings is a much easier one. It is intimately tied up with the method of working, and with the position of the iron ore deposits which are being worked. Where they are comparatively shallow, with no limestone above them, I believe that there is no difficulty about restoration to agricultural use, and that it is, in fact, proceeding. It is however, very desirable that the public should appreciate the position, and my second question to my right hon. Friend is whether in such easy cases restoration is, in fact, proceeding, and if so, over what total area.

Perhaps the main difficulty arises where the ironstone lies at a greater depth, and with limestone above it. In such cases, excavation is now proceeding by mechanical shovels, which dig up the whole of the soil and the limestone above the iron ore, and leave it in hill and dale, practically

incapable of restoration or of use for any but limited forestry purposes. In most such places, however, there seems to be no difficulty in removing the top soil by a dragline, setting it apart and replacing it on top of the workings of the shovel. This would, of course, from the excavating point of view be an unnecessary additional cost, but it should be incurred if it is necessary for the restoration of the countryside. . . .

. . . The third question I wish to ask my right hon. Friend is whether, where one method of excavation will ensure restoration at additional cost, he will insist on restoration as a condition of allowing the work to be done. If not, what price does he put on the amenities and beauty of the countryside? That is to say, up to what figure would he impose additional excavating costs in order to ensure restoration? Curiously enough, the very deep deposits seem to present less difficulty than the moderately deep ones. The shovel cannot get at them unless the dragline is put on for the top soil, and that which ought to be done on public grounds in the case of the moderately deep deposits is done as a matter of business for the very deep ones. My right hon. Friend is no doubt aware that for that reason restoration is proceeding at such a deep deposit as that on Prior's Hill Farm at Gretton, while the neighbouring deposit near Stanion is being worked by the shovel alone.

I understand that a few very large draglines have been imported from dollar countries and that it is hoped that they can so work the moderately deep deposits, even with some limestone intervening, as to allow of full restoration. My last question to my right hon. Friend is what has been the result of trying out these very large draglines, and what hope can he hold out that, even in competition with the National Coal Board, enough of them will be available to ensure full restoration in cases where it might otherwise be difficult?

This is a question of urgency in view of the state of public opinion. It is also a question of how far money ought to be spent in preventing the devastation of our countryside, where prevention is possible but costly. I suggest to my right hon. Friend that lost acres can never be replaced and that the responsibility of the ironstone companies in this matter is considerable. If, since the past workings were arranged for at the time and have now been worked out and abandoned, he considers it inequitable to put an additional burden on private interests in respect of them, then surely he must face up to the question of public responsibility. . . . It is intolerable that Northamptonshire should stay as it is; even more intolerable that further work should proceed without full restoration, wherever restoration is possible, not merely economically practicable.

Mr. Manningham-Buller: . . . I do not propose to comment on the speech of the hon. and learned Gentleman, but I think that his descriptive powers regarding the situation in Northamptonshire as it exists today are rather lacking. He could not present a picture as bad as it really is—and it will look worse in the future if something is not done. I think that the record of the Minister of Town and Country Planning is quite deplorable. We have had all sorts of promises, we got something put into the Town and Country Planning Act and we have raised the matter here; but the Minister remains in his Ministry and the situation in Northamptonshire deteriorates. . . .

The Minister of Town and Country Planning (Mr. Silkin): I should like to congratulate my hon. and learned Friend (Mr. Mitchison) on seizing this opportunity of raising

this question once more. He has shown an almost insatiable thirst for information on this subject. Every Tuesday there is a batch of Questions about it, and this evening we have been treated to a good many more. I do not think it is possible for me in the short time available to make a full statement on the situation, but I think it might be useful if I brought the House back to a sense of proportion in this matter. . . . Of 6,500 acres worked in Northamptonshire before the introduction of planning control in 1946 only 19 per cent. are left as hill and dale. . . . Forty-five per cent. of the land that had been worked had been restored to agriculture without planning control at all. In other cases there had been afforestation; a certain amount of land had been used for industrial or other purposes; and, in fact, at the time of the introduction of planning control only one-third of 1 per cent. of the agricultural land in Northamptonshire was of the kind my hon. and learned Friend described as "derelict." . . .

Since then more land has been worked. Still the process of after-treatment continues. It is estimated that in 1949, for instance, 33 acres will become derelict in Northamptonshire. . . . If we take the estimated amount of dereliction over the next 10 years, it is about 500 acres. . . . To insist on full restoration is to ask something which is quite impracticable. One has to face up to the fact that, unpleasant as the land in the area may be, what is going on in Northamptonshire and in the surrounding counties is an essential process in the economic life of our country. One cannot do without this iron ore; it has got to be worked and worked efficiently, and one cannot dictate to the producers how they are to work it; they must be left to work it in the way they consider to be most efficient. . . . Let us take, for instance, this question of complete restoration. There was a public inquiry some months ago in respect of an application to work a large area in Northamptonshire. Evidence was given on behalf of the producer that it would cost £2,000 per acre to restore that land after working to agricultural use. When it had been restored it would be worth from £50 to £70 per acre. It may be that the figure of £2,000 is an exaggeration, but it was given by a highly reputable and presumably well-informed and competent expert. . . . to impose a condition on a producer, which is what I am being asked to do, that in all cases we should insist on restoration to agricultural use, seems to me to savour of a lunatic asylum. How can one run an undertaking economically by spending £2,000 per acre in order to get something worth £50 to £70? Allowing for complete pessimism on the part of this expert, and assuming that we divide the figure by two, three or four, we are still left with £500 per acre in order to get something worth £50 to £70 an acre. . . . it is no good imposing conditions which will kill the industry or are impracticable. We want this production to go on, and we have to impose conditions which are sensible and practicable. I say that to insist upon full restoration in all cases is sheer nonsense. We have to form a judgment as to what are the right kind of conditions to impose to ensure, on the one hand, that as much land as possible is restored to agricultural use, and, on the other hand, that the industry is allowed to continue and produce. We have, of course, to have regard to amenities. I recognise that as being important, and that a price has to be paid for it. But there is another factor.

We must accept the position that probably we shall have to spend in any case rather more in after-treatment than will be the value of the land when we have carried out the treatment. We must accept that in the interests of amenities

and in the interests of growing food. What is the right figure? If we are prepared to spend £2,000 an acre, or £1,000 or £500, there are millions of acres of marginal land in the country where the same amount might be expended much more profitably. We cannot ignore that consideration, and we have to face up to it.

There is also the question whether it is desirable, in certain cases to press for afforestation instead of complete restoration to agricultural use. At this moment we do not really know enough about hills and dales to be quite satisfied in all cases what is the right kind of treatment, and whether, if we press for afforestation in cases where, for instance, there is a great amount of limestone, we shall get successful results. It is for that reason, and for a variety of other reasons, that I decided to set up this conference. . . .

. . . Now that I have the report of these conferences, I am in a position to tell the House in substance what the proposals are, and I propose in the near future—I hope in January—to publish a White Paper setting out what the proposals are, and what I think are likely to be reasonable conditions that can be imposed. . . .

"The World's Foremost Problem"

The *Dearborn Independent* articles of 1920 to 1923, later published in book form under the title "The International Jew", have been considered to be the best introduction to the Jewish Problem. We believe that the version recently published by Mr. G. F. Green at 56, Gloucester Road, New Barnet, Herts., which gives the gist of the four volumes containing the original articles, is meeting with considerably greater sales resistance in England than in the United States and Africa. The published price is 9/- net.

The page before the text of the edition bears the following quotation from Werner Sombart's *The Jews and Modern Capitalism*:—

"At first sight it would seem as if the economic system of North America was the very one that developed independently of the Jews. . . . Nevertheless, I uphold my assertion that the United States (perhaps more than any other land) are filled to the brim with the Jewish spirit. This is recognised in many quarters, above all those best capable of forming a judgment on the subject. . . .

"In the face of this fact, is there not some justification for the opinion that the United States owe their very existence to the Jews? And if this is so, how much more can it be asserted that Jewish influence made the United States just what they are—that is, American? For what we call Americanism is nothing else, if we may say so, than the Jewish spirit distilled."

Correction

T.S.C., November 19, page 1: for M. Lapointe please read Mr. St. Laurent.

"Who Would Be Free Themselves Must Strike The Blow"

Extracts from Speeches by the Late

NORMAN JACQUES, M.P.

Price: TWO PENCE (Postage extra)

K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS, LTD.

LIVERPOOL.

Goethe's Message For Our Time

"... the message of Goethe to the man of to-day is the same as to the man of his own time and the man of all times, namely: 'Strive to be really man! And thou thyself, be as a man living an inner life, a man who, in a way that corresponds to his own nature, is a man of action.'

"But, the question arises, can we in the terrible circumstances of our time still achieve such personal human existence? Do we still possess the minimum of material and spiritual individual independence which is the requisite condition for success? The circumstances of the age in which we live are indeed such that the man of the present day hardly possesses any material independence at all, whilst his spiritual independence is also most seriously threatened. In every way our position, daily becoming more unnatural, is developing in a direction which involves that in every respect man more and more ceases to be a being who belongs to Nature and himself, and is ever more subjected to the social organisation in which he lives.

"There arises a question which even half a lifetime ago we should have regarded as impossible: Is there any longer any sense in holding on to the ideal of personal human individuality, when circumstances are developing in just the opposite direction, or is it not on the contrary our duty to adjust ourselves to a new ideal of human existence, in accordance with which man is destined to attain a differently constituted perfection of his being in unreserved absorption into organised society?

"But what else is this than that we, like Faust, going astray in an appalling fashion, should break away from Nature and surrender ourselves to a monstrous unnaturalness?

"And indeed, what else is that which is going on in this frightful age than a gigantic repetition of the Faust-drama played on the world-stage? In thousands of flames the cottage of Philemon and Baucis is burning! In thousandfold acts of violence and thousandfold deeds of murder a mentality which has lost all human qualities wages its wanton sport! With a thousand grimaces Mephistopheles grins in our faces! In thousandfold ways man has let himself be led to renounce his natural relationship to reality and to seek his weal in the magic formulas[*] of some economic or social system which only thrusts still further the possibility of escape from economic and social misery!

"And the terrible significance of these magic formulas, to whatever school of economic and social witchcraft they may belong, is always that the individual has to surrender his material and spiritual personal existence, and may continue to live only as belonging body and soul to a plurality which controls him absolutely.

"Goethe could not foresee that a time would come when economic circumstances would in this way make for the destruction of the material independence of the individual. But with the mysterious prescience by which he was conscious of the danger of the introduction of machinery, whose first beginnings he experienced, he foresaw that in the future the spiritual independence of mankind would be menaced by the appearance of a mass-will. This foreboding was the cause of his unconquerable aversion for all that was revolutionary. In his eyes revolutionary activity was mass-will trying

to subject individual wills to itself. As a witness of the first indications of mass-will in the French Revolution and in the movement of the wars of liberation, he had a clear consciousness that something had made its appearance whose consequences reached beyond the range of vision. Hence his hesitant attitude to the wars of liberation, an attitude that gave occasion to much misinterpretation. He certainly desired freedom for his fellow-countrymen, but the manifestation of a mass-will directed to this end had for him a sinister look, as we know from a conversation he had with the Professor of History at Jena, Luden by name, in 1813, when with deep emotion he gave vent to thoughts which he usually kept to himself.

"He was the first to experience something like fear for the future of humanity. At a time when others were still unconcerned, it dawned upon him that the great problem with which approaching developments would be concerned must be how the individual would be able to maintain himself against the majority."—Albert Schweitzer: *Goethe* (1949).

BOOKS TO READ

By C. H. Douglas:—

The Brief for the Prosecution.....	8/6
Economic Democracy	(edition exhausted)
Social Credit	3/6
The Monopoly of Credit	(reprinting)
Credit Power and Democracy	6/6
Warning Democracy	(edition exhausted)
The Big Idea	2/6
Programme for the Third World War.....	2/-
The "Land for the (Chosen) People" Racket.....	2/-
The Realistic Position of the Church of England	8d.
Money and the Price System.....	7d.
The Use of Money.....	7d.
The Tragedy of Human Effort.....	7d.
The Policy of a Philosophy.....	7d.
Realistic Constitutionalism	6d.
Security, Institutional and Personal.....	6d.
Reconstruction	6d.
Social Credit Principles	1½d.
The Republican Victory in the U.S.A.....	1d.

ALSO

Secret Societies and Subversive Movements by Nesta H. Webster	20/-
Sous le Signe de l'Abondance by Louis Even.....	10/-
The Surrender of an Empire by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
The Socialist Network by Nesta H. Webster.....	10/-
Elements of Social Credit, 6/-.....(Cloth Edition)	7/6
Report of the Royal Commission on Soviet Espionage	7/-
Odium v. Stratton (Verbatim Report of Proceeding).....	2/6
Does it Fit the Facts?.....	4/-
Protocols of Zion	2/-
Communism in Action U.S.A. House Document No. 754.....	2/-
The Rulers of Russia by the Rev. Denis Fahey, C.S.Sp.	1/6
The Problem of the Medical Profession by B.W.M.....	1/-
British Medicine and Alien Plans by Andrew Rugg-Gunn, M.B., F.R.C.S.....	1/-

(Please allow for posting when remitting).

From K.R.P. PUBLICATIONS LIMITED,

7, VICTORIA STREET, LIVERPOOL, 2.

[*] If due weight be given to the adjective, 'magic', we think Social Crediters may not dissent.—Editor, T.S.C.